

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 12, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-10 were pending, objected to claim 10, and rejected claims 1-9. Claims 1, 5-8 and 10 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, new claim 11 has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-11 are pending for consideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

On page 2, item 2 of the Office Action, claims 5-7 and 10 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 5-7 and 10 have been amended to address the informalities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

On page 3, item 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook (U.S. Patent No. 5,504,757).

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action alleged that Cook discloses a transmission rate control circuit for changing its own operation speed when the transmission rate must be switched (see Office Action, page 4, lines 2-5). However, amended claim 1 recites "a transmission rate control circuit **configured to change an operation speed of the interface device** when the transmission rate must be switched."

It is respectfully submitted that Cook does not disclose the aforementioned features of claim 1. Rather Cook is directed to a method for selecting transmission speeds for transmitting data packets over a serial bus. Specifically, Fig. 3 of Cook describes steps used in a system to determine the maximum data packet speed for data packet transmission (see Cook, col. 7, line 50 to col. 8, line 30). Further, Fig. 3 of Cook illustrates the system entering source and destination node IDs for all nodes in the network. Then the system sets the left node and the right node to initialize the packet speed. As a result, the packet speed is set by comparing the nodes. Stated another way, Cook describes setting the data packet speed between the nodes.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Cook. Claims 3, 5, and 6 depend from independent claim 1 and inherit the patentable features thereof. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5 and 6 patentably distinguish over Cook.

Regarding the rejection of claim 8, the Office Action alleged that Cook discloses changing operation speeds of each device and the interface device when switching to a high-speed transmission rate is required and each device included in a route to a transmission destination is compatible for the high-speed transmission (see Office Action, page 5, lines 10-14). However, amended claim 8 recites, "**providing the interface device and each device that**

are configured to change its own operation speed; and changing operation speeds of each device and the interface device from a low-speed transmission rate to a high-speed transmission rate when switching to a high-speed transmission rate is required”.

It is respectfully submitted that Cook does not disclose the aforementioned features of claim 8. Rather, as discussed above, Fig. 3 of Cook describes setting the data packet speed between the nodes. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Cook for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

On page 5, item 5 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Domon (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,408).

The Office Action alleged that Domon discloses a transmission rate control circuit for changing its own operation speed when the transmission rate must be switched (see Office Action, page 5, line 21 to page 6, line 2). However, amended claim 1 recites “a transmission rate control circuit **configured to change an operation speed of the interface device** when the transmission rate must be switched”. It is respectfully submitted that Domon does not disclose the aforementioned features of claim 1. Rather, Domon is directed to a speed converter for IEEE-1394 serial bus network. Specifically, Figs. 9A to 9D of Domon describe a master plug register (MPR) and a plug control register (PCR) where the initial values of the MPR and PCR in the transceiver node are set equal to parameters set in the corresponding registers of a communication node (see Domon, col. 7, lines 61-67). Further, Figs. 8B and 8C of Domon illustrate that these data rate capabilities and data rate fields of nodes are set equal to speed value of 400 Mbps (see Domon, col. 8, lines 1-3). Therefore, Domon describes storing data rate capability and data rate.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Domon.

On page 6, item 8 of the Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Cook in view of Harumoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,460,097).

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and inherits the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Cook taken alone. Moreover, nothing was cited or found in Harumoto that cures the deficiencies of Cook as mentioned above with respect to claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Cook and Harumoto.

On page 7, item 9 of the Office Action, claims 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Domon.

Claims 4 and 9 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, and inherit the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 9 patentably distinguish over Cook taken alone. Moreover, nothing was cited or found in Domon that cures the deficiencies of Cook as mentioned above with respect to claims 1 and 8. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 9 patentably distinguish over the combination of Cook and Domon.

On page 9, item 10 of the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of background of Cook. Claim 7 depends indirectly from claim 1 and inherits the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Cook and the background of Cook.

New claim 11 has been added to emphasize configuring a transmission rate control circuit to change operation speed of at least one of a plurality of devices when a transmission rate must be switched. Nothing was cited or found in the combination of references to disclose the aforementioned features of claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the combination of references.

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/725,587

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 12, 2007

By: 
Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501